REMARKS

Claims 6-25 had been canceled. Claims 1-5 and 26-30 are currently pending in the present application, of which Claims 1, 4, 26 and 29 have been amended.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-5 and 26-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for not particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter that applicant regards as the invention. Applicant respectfully traverses such rejection insofar as it might apply to the claims as amended herein.

All occurrences of the phrase "software tool" and "software tools" in Claims 1 and 26 have been amended to "software resource" and "software resources," respectively, to be consistent with the terms being used in the specification. As such, the § 112 rejection is believed to be overcome.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-5 and 26-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Nielsen* (US 6,182,229). Applicant respectfully traverses such rejection insofar as it might apply to the claims as amended herein.

Amended Claim 1 (and similarly Claim 26) now recites a step of "allowing each of a plurality of software resources to register its password in said password registry via a respective one of a plurality of front-end processes within said workstation..."

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the allowing step is disclosed by *Nielsen* in Figure 1B and in col. 1, lines 32-43. However, neither Figure 1B nor col. 1, lines 32-43 of *Nielsen* teaches the claimed multiple front-end processes within a workstation. As such, *Nielsen* does not discloses the allowance of each of multiple software resources "to register its password in said password registry via a respective one of a plurality of front-end processes within said workstation," as claimed.

Claim 1 also recites a step of "in response to an access request to one of said software resources via a corresponding one of said front-end processes, determining if an encrypted password associated with said requested software resource is stored in said password registry" and a step of "in a determination that said encrypted password associated within said requested software resource is stored in said password registry, sending said encrypted password from said password registry to said corresponding front-end process for decryption in order to permit said access request."

On pages 3-4 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the claimed determining step and the claimed sending step are disclosed by *Nielsen* in col. 4, lines 46-64. According to *Nielsen*, in response to a request, the database of Figure 2 is scanned for an entry having the URL of the website sending the authentication request (col. 4, line 60-63). In contrast, in response to an access request, the claimed invention determines "if an encrypted password associated with said requested software resource is stored in said password registry" (emphasis added). Thus, the claimed invention is searching for an encrypted password in the password registry instead of an URL of a website, as disclosed by *Nielsen*.

In addition, Claim 1 recites a step of "in a determination that said encrypted password associated within said requested software resource is not stored in said password registry, notifying said front-end process to prompt for a password from a user."

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the claimed notifying step is disclosed by *Nielsen* in col. 4, lines 64-66. According to *Nielsen* in col. 4, lines 64-66, a user is prompted for a password when the master password was not previously entered. However, when no URL of the website is found (which the Examiner attempts to characterize as "encrypted password associated within said requested software resource is not stored in said password registry" in the claimed invention), *Nielsen* teaches that the password management system carries out a series of steps related to registration that are discussed in Figure 4 (col. 5, lines 1-3). Since none of the steps in Figure 4 of *Nielsen* is related to "notifying said front-end process to prompt for a password from a user," as claimed, the § 102 rejection is believed to be overcome.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-5 and 26-30 are currently pending in the present application. Applicant believes that independent Claims 1 and 26 along with their respective dependent claims are in condition for allowance. The remaining prior art cited by the Examiner but not relied upon has been reviewed and is not believed to show or suggest the claimed invention.

No fee or extension of time is believed to be necessary; however, in the event that any addition fee or extension of time is required for the prosecution of the present application, please charge it against IBM Deposit Account No. **09-0447**.

Respectfully submitted,

Antony P. Ng
Registration No. 43,427
DILLON & YUDELL, LLP
8911 N. Capital of Texas Hwy., suite 2110
Austin, Texas 78759
(512) 343-6116

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT